UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

The Folly of Wisdom - *Kenneth L. Patton*

The Nazification of the German Churches - - - - - - *D. Meyer-Kluegel*

Companionship Between Parents and Children - - - - - - *Ethel S. Beer*

Danger in the West - - *O. A. Hammand*

G. G. Coulton: Historian and Humanist - - - - - *F. H. Amphlett Micklewright*

The Three Great Powers - - *Devere Allen*

A Record Year for Consumer Cooperatives - - - - - - *Wallace J. Campbell*

WESTERN CONFERENCE NEWS

VOLUME CXXXIII NUMBER 2

Chicago, May-June, 1947

PRICE TWENTY-FIVE CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

Published Bimonthly Until Further Notice

Subscription $1.50 Single Copies 25 cents

Published by The Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago 15, Ill.

"Re-entry as Second-Class Matter pending at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

CURTIS W. REESE, *Editor*

Contributors

Devere Allen: Editor-in-Chief of *Worldover Press.*

Ethel S. Beer: Author of *Day Nursery.*

Wallace J. Campbell: Editor of *Cooperative News Service.*

O. A. Hammand: Attorney at law and free lance writer.

Homer A. Jack: Executive Secretary of the Chicago Council Against Racial and Religious Discrimination.

Jack Mendelsohn, Jr.: Minister of The Church of the Christian Union (Unitarian), Rockford, Illinois.

F. H. Amphlett Micklewright: Minister of Cross St. Chapel, Manchester, England.

D. Meyer-Kluegel: Formerly a barrister in Germany, connected with the Central Church Administration. Recently a lecturer to German prisoners-of-war in England on behalf of the British Control Office for Germany and Austria.

Kenneth L. Patton: Minister of the First Unitarian Society of Madison, Wisconsin.

James M. Yard: Executive Director of the Chicago Round Table of Christians and Jews.

Contents

EDITORIAL—
The Liberal Position—CURTIS W. REESE 23

ARTICLES—
The Folly of Wisdom—KENNETH L. PATTON 25
The Nazification of the German Churches—D. MEYER-KLUEGEL .. 28
Companionship Between Parents and Children—ETHEL S. BEER .. 30
Danger in the West—O. A. HAMMAND 31
G. G. Coulton: Historian and Humanist—F. H. AMPHLETT MICKLEWRIGHT 32
The Three Great Powers—DEVERE ALLEN 35
A Record Year for Consumer Cooperatives—WALLACE J. CAMPBELL 36

THE STUDY TABLE—
Symbol of Tragedy—JACK MENDELSOHN, JR. 37
An Exciting Novel—JAMES M. YARD 38
Civil Liberties—HOMER A. JACK 38
Negro Life—JAMES M. YARD 39

CORRESPONDENCE—
Generosity Toward Niemoeller—KARL M. CHWOROWSKY 39

WESTERN CONFERENCE NEWS 40

THE FIELD
Education for Political Responsibility Seen As Supreme Need of Nation's Youth—ENCAMPMENT FOR CITIZENSHIP 22

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Education for Political Responsibility Seen As Supreme Need of Nation's Youth

National delegates to the annual American Ethical Union Conference meeting in St. Louis from May 15 to 18 devoted one of its sessions to an examination of the needs of youth in this country. "The need for educating youth for political responsibility, for creating a citizenship to meet today's challenge to the democratic way of life, is as important as combatting juvenile delinquency," said Robert Kohn, president of the American Ethical Union. "The *Encampment for Citizenship* whose first six-week summer session we sponsored last year, was designed to fulfill this very need," he declared. Located at the Fieldston Ethical Culture School in Riverdale, N. Y., the second *Encampment for Citizenship,* from June 30 to August 9, will bring together young people, aged seventeen to twenty-three years, from all over the nation, from widely varying economic backgrounds, from different racial strains, to live and work and study together in a unique educational project.

The program consists of lectures given by staff members and outstanding guests, small discussion groups led by trained resident staff members, and visits to agencies dealing with four phases of democratic life, namely, the economic life of the city and the nation, international issues, civil liberties and minority problems. During the six-week session, stress is laid on the techniques of citizenship—the strategy of democratic action. Instruction is given in public speaking, propaganda analysis, how to work with political parties and other organizations, and the function and responsibility of citizen leaders.

Reports on the backgrounds of the 130 campers who attended the 1946 session showed them to be from 27 states, from rural as well as urban centers, from among the rich and the poor. They were recruited from college campuses, the Y's, trade, industrial and farm unions, and other youth groups. There were white and Negro, Mexican-Americans, and Japanese-Americans; Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish faiths were represented.

The headquarters for the *Encampment for Citizenship* is at 2 West 64th Street in New York City. Applications from over twenty states including Missouri, Montana, Iowa, and North Dakota, have been received. The tuition is $125.00 which covers everything, except transportation to Camp and personal spending money. Churches, trade unions, cooperatives, settlement houses, and other youth agencies, such as 4H clubs, the Y's, farm organizations, and women's clubs are urged to sponsor promising young people who have shown some leadership ability in their own organizations. Scholarships are available for those that are especially deserving.

—*Encampment for Citizenship.*

UNITY

Volume CXXXIII MAY - JUNE, 1947 No. 2

The Liberal Position

CURTIS W. REESE

This is not a time for liberals of the genteel tradition who are frightened in the presence of explosive issues that blast their world and shake the earth. It is not a time for liberals of the pious tradition who believe that all is right with the world and that all things work together for good. It is not a time for confused liberals who move simultaneously in all directions without arriving anywhere in particular.

This is a time for liberals who believe that the only form of society worth building and perpetuating is one grounded in respect for the integrity of persons, committed to critical inquiry, and devoted to abundant freedom.

The confusion of thought in all areas of life, together with the revival of tyranny in politics and of bigotry in religion, make it especially necessary that liberals understand clearly what the liberal position means; and that liberal movements take the offensive against totalitarian control of the human spirit, and in behalf of expanding liberty and a free world.

Sweeping aside the accidental accretions of history, the main framework of the liberal position may be briefly, but I think accurately, stated as (1) belief in the inherent worth of persons, involving their right to freedom; (2) devotion to objective inquiry, involving respect for facts and integrity in dealing with them; (3) loyalty to the conception of justice, involving fairness to all without regard to differences in origin or affiliation; (4) the supremacy of intelligence, involving the reappraisal of institutions and customs in accord with the growing life of man; and (5) the relative nature of liberty itself, involving the relativity of liberty both as principle and method to a framework of purpose.

Underneath these liberal principles is the bedrock presupposition that the universe is so constituted that on the human level and within the limitations of the natural scene human intelligence is determinative; that we are not mere cogs in a cosmic spinning wheel.

I find it difficult to imagine a form of society, whether secular or ecclesiastical, that denied these principles and still deserved the respect and loyalty of a free soul. They are permanent and not transient values. They are positive and not negative principles which when practised become virtues of the first order and which when violated make all else of little importance. They condition the worth of all other values and without them no other goods can constitute the good life. They are essential to the expansion of knowledge and the development of persons. To the extent that any form of society neglects them, whether that form of society is individualistic or collectivistic, primitive or atomic, it is to that extent a tyranny.

It would appear that a position and a movement representing such significant principles would have caught the imagination of at least the best minds and won the loyalty of the many who have felt the pressures of authoritarian controls, but such has not been the case. There are clergymen who have caught the vision but who have succumbed to the invitation of convenience or the pull of convention. There are statesmen who have seen the light but who have been maneuvered into the shadow or pressured into the darkness. There are men of letters and men of labor who have set their feet on the liberal way but who have stumbled into the abyss of totalitarianism.

There are reasons why this is so; and the liberal movement itself must bear a large share of the blame. It is not enough to point out the areas of illiberalism and to chasten the illiberal. We must look within the liberal tradition itself for the causes of its weakness. And the chief causes seem to be these: The liberal movement has allowed itself to be identified with historically passing social theories; it has neglected the areas of economic well-being; and it has treated motivation as if it were sensitive only to the ring of a cash register.

The accidental historical association of the liberal position with a competitive economy need not be considered as divinely appointed and forever binding. The liberal position has functioned in a laissez-faire society and there is no inherent reason why it cannot function in a cooperative society. Much of the present-day criticism of the liberal position is due to the fact that it is identified in the minds of the proletariat as an upper-class system designed to perpetuate privilege and hold back the movement of democracy. That liberals and liberal movements have given ground for such

appraisal is beyond dispute; but in so doing they themselves have violated the liberal spirit and temper.

Any economic system must be judged by the extent to which it equitably supplies plentiful goods and services to all the people. Judged by this standard, no system yet devised—either Capitalism or Communism—is good enough to meet the requirements of a really liberal society; and there is no reason why the liberal movement should identify itself with any particular system of economy and be sensitive to attacks upon it. A liberal who knows what the implications of his position are should know that he cannot commit himself to either Adam Smith or Karl Marx, or to any particular economic system. The future must be kept open for experiments in scientific and intelligent developments in social theory and practice.

But there is no denying the fact that in general liberals, being in the main from the more privileged areas of society, have been averse to dealing radically with social problems. We have said equality of opportunity, but we have not said mutual aid in the use of opportunity. We have temporized where decisive action was called for, and this has not endeared us to the great multitudes who live constantly on the brink of economic disaster. There is justice to the charge that we have been silent when we should have been heard; that we have been absent from scenes of conflict when we should have been present; and that we have excused wrongs when we should have blasted them with condemnation. It is difficult for persons whose weekly paycheck stands between them and utter destitution to appreciate the virtues of free inquiry. The principle of the free mind gives little satisfaction to victims of discrimination. It is difficult to hear the quiet voice of reason above the crackling flames of a lynching bee or the hiss of a blowtorch!

Moreover, the liberal movement has not appealed sufficiently to the venturesome and heroic motivations. There has been a too-ready acceptance of the individualistic notion that man is motivated by personal gain and a too-easy capitulation to the collectivist notion that economic forces determine the trend of events. From the point of view of ethical motivation there is little choice between the theory that private gain is man's chief incentive and the theory that the patterns of history are of economic derivation. There are numerous categories of motivation, from personal glory to sacrificial death, that dwarf the claims of the hypothetical economic man and challenge all rhythmic theories of historical processes. The love of little children, the affection of comrades, the appeal of the afflicted, the claims of mercy, and the call of justice have not yet lost their power; and no cold, calculating abstraction can ever take their place as moving forces in the souls of man. Such sources of power the liberal would do well to cultivate.

But a more fruitful line of procedure for making the liberal movement effective in the world today is the building of positive attitudes, based on liberal principles, and relating concretely to specific problems and pressing issues that occupy the attention of men and nations.

First, and perhaps most important of all, we must be alert to encroachments on the freedom of persons. The stealth, the intrigue, and the wicked designs of the illiberal are a constant menace. They creep upon us from the right clothed in the most innocent garb of "America First," or they leap at us from the left waving the most inviting anti-Fascist banners. Only the most vigorous alertness can avail to keep us oriented toward liberty.

A second attitude that we need to cultivate is that of unfaltering resistance to limitations of the area of inquiry and communication. It is not alone in the field of religion that dogmas tend to set limits beyond which one is not supposed to venture. In politics and in social arrangements dogmas limit thought and stifle inquiry. In education and in industry one must constantly fight against dogmas and fixed processes. In every field of life sacred cows block the highways, lounge in front of public buildings, and consume sustenance needed for creative purposes. Laws and committee procedures, supervisory regulations and censorship, prohibitions and conventions, habits and arched brows—all lay restrictions on freedom of inquiry and communication.

The liberal must be alert to such encroachments and limitations. The very fact that any portal is closed should arouse his suspicion and nerve him for ventures beyond the sacred limits. The fact that any dogma is considered certain should stir the liberal to rebellion. I dislike to see the liberal accepting as certainty even the theory of evolution, or the law of relativity. All special preserves should be invaded and all iron curtains torn asunder. The quest for uncertainty has its virtues.

The invasion of the public schools by sectarian instruction with accompanying ecclesiastical raids on the exchequer of the public, the imposition of authoritarian discipline, and the operation of governmental commissions checking on the thoughts of the people, are encroachments upon freedom and should be condemned as such. It is forever true that liberty is maintained by vigilance and extended by pressure.

From an organizational point of view, liberal movements need to be more active in the protection of their lines of purpose and more vigorous and effective on the offensive. The traditional amorphous liberal and democratic movements are easy victims of intrigue. Liberals themselves are sometimes ensnared in the sophistry that it is illiberal for a liberal movement to protect its liberty and that it is undemocratic for a democratic movement to protect its democracy. Such sophistry grows out of failure to understand that lib-

erty does not exist in vacuo but that it is related to a framework of purpose. The purposes of organized movements are not arbitrarily determined by individual caprice. They grow out of history, they are organic to the genius of a movement, and they may not be violated with impunity. Liberal movements are no exception. They may of right and must of necessity protect themselves from invasion by the enemies of liberty, and failure to do so means organizational impotence which has too often characterized liberal movements in our time.

But defensive tactics alone do not win victories. We need to challenge to open combat the intolerant and the bigoted, the unjust and the vicious. Timidity will not do. Being too proud to fight will not do. Fear of contamination by contact with unpopular causes will not do. The liberal offensive must challenge the forces of orthodoxy, including the superstition-ridden Vatican, the dialectically encrusted Kremlin, and all other forms of totalitarianism.

It is not enough to be a respected but harmless minority. We must aim to be a force to be reckoned with and to be feared by forces that hold back the movement of mankind toward a free, a fair, and a just world.

Liberty's framework of purpose grows out of a history of concern for the well-being of persons. The framework is there but content must be built into the framework in accord with the needs of succeeding generations. In our time the great need is for the building of social content into the framework of liberal principles. Liberty to be hungry and cold, liberty to live in rags and die in despair, is not meaningful liberty. No one who has tasted poverty and felt the pinch of insecurity, and no one who has heard the tramping feet of the unemployed and the wail of the dispossessed, can regard liberty as a mere framework of abstractions. The liberal movement needs to move into the areas where men toil and sweat, where bread is made and ore is melted; where discrimination is felt, and where lingering hope fades into death. Ivory towers, church towers, and towers of commerce are not suitable dwelling places for an awakened liberal spirit.

A final attitude that the liberal movement must maintain if it is to win leadership in our day is that of keeping oriented toward the idea of a community of the world. The one world toward which we move with atomic speed could be a world enforced by tyrants and managed by bigots. We want it to be a beloved community motivated by regard for persons and peoples, and managed by intelligence for ends that are honorable and just. I fear one world unless it is possessed with a liberal spirit and temper.

We must not think of one world merely in terms of rocket planes and atomic power. These and other products of inventive minds will not save the world unless principles of liberty, of democracy, and of religion dominate things and make them serve the spirit of man. We must arouse in the souls of the citizens of one world love of liberty, respect for truth, and devotion to justice.

The Folly of Wisdom

KENNETH L. PATTON

A couple of years ago I was sitting across from a woman at a large dinner, and in the course of the introductions she learned that I was minister of a Unitarian church. And she commented that she had listened to several of my radio programs. Since that made a pleasant topic of conversation, at least for me, it was pursued, and it came out that she no longer listened to them. When I asked why, she said that she found herself drawn to the unorthodox opinions expressed, and she did not want to lose the Lutheran faith in which she was raised, so she had quit listening. It seemed that she had struggled with similar heretical ideas when attending the University. But they undermined beliefs that she wished to hold onto, so she turned her back resolutely upon them. She preferred to believe.

"When ignorance is bliss, 'tis folly to be wise." Perhaps this woman believed that she was turning away from the folly of wisdom. For, if these ideas had not been attractive, logical, compelling, she would not have feared that they would impair her faith. It was the possibility of new truth, disturbing truths, truths that would cause disruption in her mental composure, her spiritual security, that she did not desire. These new ideas, if she had fostered and followed them, would likely have led her to change her church affiliation. They would likely have led to opposition from members of her family. They might have disaffected her from the social set in which she moved. If being ignorant was the necessary price, she preferred to remain ignorant and keep her social tenure, continue in the warmth and familiarity of old faiths.

What are the relative merits of steadfastness of faith, security, conservation of ancient creeds, as against the often bewildering, uneasy, dangerous, but exhilarating venture of doubt and mental and spiritual evolution and growth? It is evident that there is a great difference of opinion in this matter. Likely the majority prefer traditionalism and conservatism. In fact, for even the most venturous, the pioneering part of life is only a very small fraction of his total set of beliefs and assumptions.

I was talking last summer with a man who had a friend who had begun to doubt his Catholic faith. This man was studying for the priesthood. All his life had been spent within the intimate and pervading community of the Church. To leave the Church meant more than to leave a set of beliefs; it was almost as if he were to move from one universe into another. It meant the uprooting of emotions and habits, of affections, anticipations, securities, enfoldments, that went back to his

earliest childhood. In his struggle of doubt he went literally through hell. He was visited with terrible loneliness, desolation. And yet he could not forestall his doubt. His old friends, leaders of the church, came to plead with him to return. It seems that the Church is especially zealous in pursuit of those preparing for the priesthood, to urge them to return to orthodoxy. Finally he succumbed to his own torture and their pleading. He did not go back to the active priesthood. His doubt would not permit that. He did leave his preparation for the liberal Protestant ministry, for he was preparing to become a Unitarian minister. When my friend saw him sometime later, he said that he was a completely hopeless and defeated person. He was not free to go in either direction, towards complete mental and spiritual freedom, or back to the comforting bosom of the mother Church.

Is ignorance ever bliss? Perhaps it is, but I doubt that ignorance is ever bliss if those who are in it suspect that they are in ignorance. Ignorance can be blissful only when those enmeshed in it think that they are residing in wisdom and truth. It is faith and surety that breed bliss.

The main appeal of the orthodox Church lies in this. We live in a world of turmoil, pain, and frustration, of depressions and wars, of turbulent evolutions in knowledge. The Church says: "In this storm of life, you need a shelter and an anchor. Amidst this doubt you need a firm and abiding surety of faith. Let us give you an eternal knowledge above all the wayward knowings of mankind, the word of God himself. The Church does not offer ignorance as the source of bliss, but knowledge, wisdom, a wisdom which it claims has issued by revelation from the very mouth of God."

Yes, those who live in ignorance often know bliss, but only as long as they are unquestioning of their dogmas. And we cannot deny that many of the fantastic and unfounded beliefs of men have sustained men in trouble, supported them in long labor. Often the facts of the case have less to do with our motivations and our morale than what we believe to be the facts of the case.

It is the cynical knowledge of this that prompts the propaganda agencies of a nation during war times to tell the people what they want them to believe, what will keep them at a fighting pitch, rather than the truth. It has lately come out that the Colin Kelly heroism story was almost a complete fabrication. He had lost his life in the line of duty, as had many others, but in no spectacular feat of superhuman daring. But our information agencies wanted a national hero to sustain the people during a period of defeat, so they made one. The myth worked just as well as if it had been a reality. We know that the atrocity stories of the last war were similarly used; we do not yet know how much of the atrocity legend of this war has been misrepresentation, if not complete fabrication. Sometimes photographs, misinterpreted, can lie even more effectively than words.

Let us ask ourselves the question, was it better that we were ignorant, or duped? It evidently served its purpose, even though some of us bridled when atrocity stories and accounts of our losses were sprung too regularly just before new bond drives. We won the war. Ignorance and deception played a part in the victory, did they not? Does not the end justify the means? If the end is bliss, should we not embrace ignorance, at least excuse it? Might it not have been more difficult to organize our nation for war if we did not simplify the issues, overestimate our virtue and the enemy's vice? Would the unvarnished facts, objectivity, reason have been folly during the war? Perhaps that can be answered only in the post-war era, when we find that it is exceedingly difficult to exchange the lies of war for the truth needed to undergird a vital peace.

Let us return for a moment to religious faith. Millions believe that a loving heavenly father watches over the human family, sustains them in their moral venture, and will gather the faithful to his eternal heaven after death. This faith takes them over many disappointments, many earthly defeats. No matter how they may fail here, they believe one day they will be rescued from this vale of tears. It sustains them in the death of those they love, for sharp as the separation may be, they have faith that there will be one day a happy reunion. When goodness seems to fail in the affairs of the market places of the world, they have the assurance that righteousness will reap its just dividends in the final balancing of God. If this be ignorance, it has great practical value for those within it.

Would it not be folly to be wise, if wisdom removed all these sweet securities, and left only a desolate universe, wherein man drifts ignored, without cosmic companion or saviour? What awaits the man who loses his faith, even though he gains wisdom? Bertrand Russell expresses it in powerful, if somewhat romantic language:

> Brief and powerless is Man's life; on him and all his race the slow, sure doom falls pitiless and dark. Blind to good and evil, reckless of destruction, omnipotent matter rolls on its relentless way; for Man, condemned today to lose his dearest, tomorrow himself to pass through the gate of darkness, it remains only to cherish, ere the blow falls, the lofty thoughts that ennoble his little day; disdaining the coward terrors of the slave of Fate, to worship at the shrine his own hands have built; undismayed by the empire of chance, to preserve a mind free from the wanton tryranny that rules his outward life; proudly defiant of the irresistible forces that tolerate, for a moment, his knowledge and his condemnation, to sustain alone, a weary, but unyielding Atlas, the world that his own ideals have fashioned despite the trampling march of unconscious power.

Such is the end of the Free Man's Worship, as Russell describes it. This is what awaits the man who gains wisdom. Is this preferable to the bliss of ignorant faith, if such we should judge it? What is the desirable end of our striving, the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, no matter how it hurts? Or should the end be happiness, serenity, security, no matter how deep the ignorance must be that will make it possible?

Let us look for a parable in an experience which is simpler, somewhat more personal. Doctors have a notion that it is bad for a patient to know too much about his own illness, especially if it is serious, or hopeless. Very often they delude the patient with false assurances of recovery, when they know there is no hope. Personally, I would judge this an intolerable condescension, an unwarranted arrogance on the part of the doctor. I know that I will one day die, and I go on living fairly worthfully in spite of my doom. Shall the doctor assume that I will lose morale, lose my spiritual stamina, because I know my end is near? I have a feeling the deception rarely comes off anyway. I believe most persons would prefer to know all the facts, to approach even their death knowingly, rather than to spend their last days in ignorance. Life should be a full, deep drink. There is a satisfaction to taste the fullness of bitterness as well as the fullness of joy. Most people can take it, and they prefer to take all of it, not have it propor-

tioned to another man's estimate of their fortitude and strength.

Beyond all practical considerations (such as this: if a man bases his life on ignorance, it may collapse if his ignorance is revealed) I believe that I should prefer the folly of wisdom, and likely name it something else than folly. But let us pause with this practical consideration for a moment. Returning to the patient that is fatally ill. If his time is short, should he not have an opportunity to settle his affairs, to arrange his last days as creatively as he can? Should not he have time to prepare himself for his death? Is it best for death to come unexpectedly, in a shock of terror at the last, or to have been foreseen? Much of the pain and evil of tragedy can be relieved if it is foreseen and prepared for, if the shock is cushioned with knowledge.

On the matter of religious belief, there is in our world no protecting of the believer within a hermetic shell of faith. The Church does not control the traffic in ideas and opinion. The burning of the books did not accomplish its task. The persecution of the heretics, the doubters, did not snuff out the breed. Cozen the child within a parochial school, shelter him through high school and college. Put the straitjacket of catechism and creed on his mind and the hood of habit and ritual over his eyes. Still he cannot be walled in.

In such an open world of the mind, ignorance or naive faith is a warrior without any coat of mail to protect it against its many protagonists. Only the willfully deaf and blind can remain in ignorance today, no matter how blissful it may be. Some are stubbornly ignorant, seeking their own kind, selecting the opinion that will fortify their established faith. But no sensitive and seeking mind today can find refuge or bliss in ignorance. A faith not built on facts, on science, on doubt and criticism, is, in this day, a house built on the sand. The storms of knowledge will wash the sand of credulity from beneath its walls, and great will be the fall thereof.

What is left for the persons we mentioned in the beginning, the woman who began to doubt and turned away from it, and the Catholic who compromised and retreated as far as he could toward his spiritual boyhood home? Can such self-conscious ignorance ever be bliss? Can a man be satisfied, find any serenity, if he is aware that he is knowingly deluding himself? Can we hide truths from ourselves by our own volition? I do not believe that we control our own mind to that extent. Much of the working of our minds is subconscious, nonvolitional. We have often experienced this when we have been unable to recall a word or some situation, and then have it pop unbidden into our consciousness several hours later. Men involved in inventing or creative thought attest to the fact that the mind works even when they are not directing it. They say that often after they have fruitlessly worked on a problem for months, the answer will come of a sudden unbidden to their minds, as if by a revelation. It is this that we mean when we talk about "sleeping on a problem."

If we transfer this to doubts and questions, what can we infer? What if we do not like a doubt and refuse to think about it, will our mind obey us? Likely not. If it is a serious doubt, if it is important enough for us to fear it, its impression on our subconscious will likely be great. It will haunt us. We will think about it without knowing it. It will keep intruding into our reveries. Things will prompt it to return to our consciousness. Or, if we do succeed in burying it in the subconscious, it will likely linger there and do great damage to our mental health, asserting itself in irrational fears and feelings of insecurity.

What is very likely is that if we are one kind of person, we have no real choice in this matter of whether we prefer the bliss of ignorance or the folly of wisdom. Whether I have gained any wisdom during my years of mental struggle is debatable, but I do know that once the seed of doubt was planted, I was helpless to restrain the plant of skepticism from growing according to its own genius, as it were. Question led to question, fact and inference led to further facts and inference. Sometimes it would subside, but always it was there plaguing, goading me, challenging my desire for a faith that I doubted. For fifteen years it drove me on until the major reconversion was done, and even yet it drives me, for we are never finally shed of all our preconceptions, all our unsubstantiated beliefs. Many we take so for granted that we are not aware of them.

Harry Elmer Barnes describes how, many years after he believed he had abandoned the traditional ideas of Christianity and the Bible, he continued to cling to the idea that Jesus was quite unique as a religious teacher. He still clung to what he has since called, "the Jesus stereotype." Then a student in one of his University classes began to challenge his statements on the uniqueness of Jesus with such cogency that he was forced from this last outpost of his traditionalism. He professes that, "with none too reverent an attitude at the outset [it] required a decade of exposure to almost unparallelled critical and scholarly resources for a dissolution of his Jesus stereotype." Mr. Barnes undoubtedly has many other stereotypes of which he is not yet aware, and of which he never will be aware. We all have them. They are inescapable.

I can see no other alternative for the sensitive, self-respecting person than the pathway to wisdom. Above all, we must continue to believe in ourselves, whatever it may cost us in comfort and happiness. There are many things worth more than happiness. Honesty, integrity, fearlessness, honor, these are to be prized above all kinds of security. And of this we can be assured, it is wisdom, won at whatever cost, that will sustain us in our pursuit of these higher values. It is never folly to be wise. For to be wise is to be developed to the stature where we can bear whatever trials, whatever stoicism, are involved in wisdom.

This is evident if we think about it for a moment. The bliss of ignorance would not be satisfaction for the man of wisdom. In our childhood we can have many blithely happy experiences that we cannot recapture in our age. For some of them are sustained by ignorance or, let us say, childish faith. But on the other hand, the adult can stand many astringencies, disappointments, accept many realities, that would shatter the more tender child. Nor is the child, in a merciful society, asked to carry the burdens of manhood. Neither does the man depend on the satisfactions of his childhood. In his wisdom he has found new values, new ideals, new satisfactions.

The person who finds satisfactions and securities in ignorance need not fear that he will be without securities and stamina if he forsakes his unlearned state for knowledge. For when he has gained knowledge, he will not be the same person that he was before. In gaining knowledge he will have grown himself. For a man is what he knows, what he believes. He will also have exchanged his old world for a new world. If many of the promises of the old world are gone, many of the

fears of the old world will have vanished with them. Nor does the death of an old promise mean that no new promise, no new hope, can grow to fill its place.

Examples come easily to mind. In losing our old faith we may lose faith in heaven, but with it we will lose the threat of hell. Also, if we lose faith that a divine being sustains and aids us, we will no longer need to dread a divine judge who will wreak his vengeance upon us. As the heavens become less roseate, the earth may take on greater promise. As an after-life fades, the present life should gain in possibility and depth. As hope for personal immortality may fade, the value of social immortality in the beloved human community should replace it as a source of profound satisfaction. As a world of miracle fades from our purview, we disclose a world amenable to the intelligence and control of man, where men can create their own miracles of transformation and creation. As the power of God fades, the power of man increases.

Those who take on the folly of wisdom have themselves a kind of faith. It is the faith that knowledge, no matter how disastrous it may seem at short range, will in the long run be a good and a creative thing. It is the faith that we must strive to create our knowledge and our wisdom, for we believe that goodness and knowledge are husband and wife, and their children are the satisfactions of life. This is the faith of the scientist, whose prime devotion is to the facts of the case in study. That alone is his final desire. Not whether they are the facts he would prefer. His heart might be set on a certain hypothesis. He may have staked his life in a certain line of research. But he will wipe out a life's work if he sees it is based on a false assumption. For he has faith that our control over our world and over our own lives depends on our knowledge. We may misuse our knowledge, but the knowledge itself is desirable, and we cannot hide knowledge just because we fear its misuse. We are betting on wisdom, confident that any of the follies committed in its name are due to its misuse.

The final extension of the religious life is not a matter of mere joy, of simple satisfaction. It is a complex and a profound experience, founded in the depth of perplexities, paradoxes, mysteries that surround us. It is to our profounder richness of life to know the fullness of whatever tragedy and misery in which we and our race are involved. The timid and the shallow life is not the worthful life. A great novel or a great symphony gains its depth of possible satisfaction from the weaving of many strands of meaning and emotion, of experience, of tragedy and joy, into one structure, where all parts play on, reinforce and sustain all the others. In a great painting no brush stroke is meaningless. Each form and each color speaks to and builds upon all the others.

So it is in our lives. No fact, no experience, is meaningless, if we can see its relationship to all the rest of history and the universe. The fullness of the spectacle of the cosmos and of man's place in it should be the desire of man to see and to comprehend. He should desire life in all its welter, in all its magnificent diversity. He should prize wisdom and understanding gained in the consideration of many things and many ideas, more greatly than the comfort of the locked and shuttered mind. It is richness, depth, magnificence of life he seeks, and this cannot be the reward of the niggardly and cowardly spirit. Only he who seeks fearlessly and faithfully after wisdom, he who loses his security and comfort in a great questing for truth, will gain his life in all its possible abundance.

The Nazification of the German Churches

D. MEYER-KLUEGEL

The Nazis in Germany are quietly reorganizing for a return to power, through capturing control of democratic institutions restored or set up by the Allies. Innumerable downright Nazis are still occupying important posts, while genuine anti-Nazis are becoming more and more disappointed because they are given no real chance to build a better and more peaceful Germany. Particularly the German churches, both the Roman Catholic and the Protestant, are once more becoming the well-camouflaged centers for a new revival of German nationalism, imperialism, and militarism. Both Catholic and Protestant reactionaries and nationalists are coming together in the Christian Democratic Union, which to a very large extent is neither Christian nor democratic, but quite plainly Fascist.

Swiss papers reported that all the newly elected Italian and German Cardinals were notorious Fascists or National Socialists. If that is true, it would explain why men like Cardinal Frings of Cologne are protecting the German big industrialists and men like Papen. At any rate, Bishop Berning of Osnabrück was so ardent a Nazi that he became even a Nazi Councillor of State, and it seems to be beyond question that he ought to be de-Nazified.

In the Protestant churches a number of men who call themselves "church leaders" have set up a "Confessional" dictatorship. All in all, about seventy people met at Treyss and Stuttgart, in October, 1945, and founded what they called the "Evangelical Church in Germany." Even their good friend and adviser, Karl Barth, had to tell them that they had built a roof into the air without a house underneath. The leaders at these assemblies were Pastor Niemöller, Bishop Meiser of the Lutheran Church of Bavaria, Bishop Wurm of the Lutheran Church of Wurttemberg, Pastor Asmussen of Hamburg, Church Councillor Lilje (a YMCA leader) and Bishop Dibelius of Berlin. How violently pro-Nazi Niemöller has been is well-known. The others are not much better. Meiser helped to overthrow the democratic government in Bavaria, and all sympathized with National Socialism for the sake of a nationalist and militarist revival. They compromised as much as possible, and "protested" only where the Nazis infringed on the rights and privileges of the churches. There can be no doubt that the Evangelical Church in Germany, proclaimed by these men, is simply Nazi totalitarianism, now carried on in the churches. It is exactly the same thing that these "Confessionals" resented when it was done in 1933 by Ludwig Müller and his "German Christians."

If there were to be one German Protestant Church instead of the twenty-eight or so provincial or regional

churches, then it would be for the General Assemblies of these churches to decide, and for that purpose first of all the parish and district councils would have to be newly elected in truly democratic elections. What is needed in Germany is not more centralization, but complete de-centralization. There has been enough "one nation, one realm, one leader." The Allied Governments in Germany should not tolerate the continuance in the churches of the *Fuhrerprinzip,* or that one German Protestant Church is formed, which would only become the nucleus for a Fourth Reich. They should insist on radical and complete de-Nazification in the churches as well as in the state. The policy of putting expediency ahead of de-Nazification will work out fatally in the long run. Already the situation in Germany begins to resemble very much that of 1919-1920 when the Free Corps started again, first secretly underground, and later coming more and more into the open as the Allies became disunited.

De-Nazification is just what the German churches want to avoid. The assembly at Treyss said:

> The necessity of such a purge is recognized by the Church, but there are serious misgivings against the procedure followed today. Punishment ought to be carried out in each case after it has been proved that people have personally given impetus to the crimes of National Socialism. Formal membership in the Nazi Party, in which large numbers of church members were involved, ought not to be punished. For reasons of doctrine and justice, the churches alone should decide who is fit to exercise the functions of church office and who should be dismissed.

Also, the Bishop of Chichester, the great English friend and protector of Niemöller and his "Confessionals," has urged the end of de-Nazification, saying:

> A very large number of those already penalized, whether interned in camps or de-Nazified out of camps, have suffered wrong. It is necessary to imprison some for security's sake. The rest should be set free.

Now the real process of de-Nazification has scarcely started. Apart from the Nuremberg Trial and a few similar minor trials, it seems to be only small fry which so far have been affected. That is certainly so in the churches where de-Nazification seems to have no other meaning than that now the "Confessionals" are ousting the "German Christians," while under the Nazis the "German Christains" ousted the "Confessionals." E.g., in the Central Church Administration in Berlin a downright Nazi is still the head of the department for the appointment of church officials and pastors. No wonder that this man and his "Confessional" friends are making life very difficult for Pastor Rackwitz who as a Socialist had been in the real Dachau concentration camp for many years. Rackwitz dared to demand the nationalization of the big estates of the churches. Also, at other Consistories the Nazis are evidently still in office. In Hanover the great compromiser Marahrens is still bishop, but it would not be a great change to replace him by Lilje.

Pastor Asmussen in Hamburg, the Foreign Secretary of the "Confessionals," has now appointed the Lutheran Pastor Rieger of London (who up to the beginning of the war belonged to the Nazi Party) to be the Dean for all Protestant prisoner-of-war camp chaplains in Great Britain. Very many of these chaplains, too, were members of the Nazi Party, very often at the same time belonging to the "Confessional Church." They have their own Theological Training Camp, under the auspices of the Ecumenical Headquarters and the YMCA. This institute is said to be a real hotbed of Nazism. One hundred and twenty anti-Nazi prisoners-of-war, all coming from different camps and meeting at Wilton Park Camp for a training course, have already complained about this "Confessional" Training Centre and a Training Institute for Teachers, both of which are at Norton Camp. Some of these one hundred and twenty prisoners-of-war had seen Norton Camp with their own eyes, others had got real Nazi pastors and teachers from there for their camps.

The great majority of the ordinary prisoners-of-war are fed up with Nazism after all they, as well as their families in Germany, have gone through, and especially many of the younger ones would thoroughly de-Nazify Germany if they were given a chance to do so. There are quite a number of prisoners-of-war who have been in Hitler's concentration camps and prisons for anti-Nazi activities, and these men have seldom been classified as anti-Nazi while rather doubtful pastors are in this category, apparently for the only reason that they are pastors and that certain segregators regard the churches in Germany as resistance movements. The majority of the prisoners-of-war are well-informed about Nazism in the German churches, and they no longer care for these churches. They are fed up also with barren dogmas and institutions, and the only religion which appeals to them is the message of the simple Jesus, the Jesus of the Sermon on the Mount and the Parables, Jesus the lover of the poor and distressed, Jesus the brother of all men, the herald of God's kingly rule of righteousness, freedom, peace, and love here and now on earth. Their watchword is: "Break up fallow ground, and sow not among thorns," (Jer. IV, 3), and they hope that after nineteen hundred years of orthodox churchianity, truly free Christians will now come forward and take the lead toward better order and peace among men. One wish often expressed is for an international training center for Free Christian youth leaders and adult school teachers, where young people from all over the world would meet and study together. First wish of all prisoners-of-war is, of course, to go home to Germany as soon as possible. Many have been behind barbed wire for four or five years, or even longer. About 100,000 came from the United States last year, where they had been promised they were sailing home to Germany; they did not know what to make of it when they read in the papers that Mr. Byrnes had officially said the United States had repatriated their prisoners-of-war.

The Nazi camp-pastors, although they have less than 10 per cent and often less than 5 per cent followers in the camps, have still a great influence and power through friends outside. They achieved the stopping, by the Control Office for Germany and Austria, of Free Christian lectures which had been voluntarily attended by seventy to eighty per cent of the prisoners-of-war. These lectures were said to be too "controversial," and even the head of the Lecture Section, a high British official, was maneuvered into a position where he could do nothing but resign. So the full-time representatives of the Niemöller party have again the monopoly.

A joint Protestant-Catholic Delegation from Britain has recently been visiting Germany. It was led by the Bishop of Chichester, and the above mentioned Pastor Rieger was interpreter. In a number of German towns groups of the "Confessional" and "Barthian" German-British Christian Fellowship (President: the Bishop of Chichester; Secretary: Pastor Rieger) have been opened, in support of Niemöller and his "Confessionals."

Companionship Between Parents and Children

ETHEL S. BEER

Companionship between parents and children is not based on any blood tie. Kinship alone cannot be the foundation of any deep human relationship. The cherished place that many adopted children fill in the family group amply proves this statement. These children are often closer to their foster parents than sons and daughters are to their own parents. But often parents do not recognize this. They assume as a matter of course that their own children are devoted to them and that biological birth alone is basis enough for companionship. Tradition has fostered this attitude despite its evident bias.

No association in this life can be taken for granted. Not only must all bonds between people be established through their own efforts but in order to last they must be striven for constantly. Companionship between parents and their children is no exception to this rule. If parents want it, they must work for it. It can no more be gained without exertion than can friendship.

Furthermore, the winning of this companionship is a gradual process starting with the connection between the parents and the small infant. In the beginning, the physical dependence of the baby is the first consideration. Its helplessness is a real tie which cannot be ignored. It cries vociferously for the attention needed and in return gives its affection to the one who satisfies these wants. The appeal of the baby is its very frailty: it cannot survive without the assistance of some adult. Quite naturally it responds readily to the person who gives it care. This is an opportunity that a mother should not miss.

Nor should the father avoid this responsibility. The homely details of keeping a baby alive and comfortable may be prosaic but they are very important. Not only does the father himself need the experience but if the infant is tended exclusively by one individual, the tendency is for the tie to become too fixed. This is true with mothers as well as nurses. So the quicker that Dad gets acquainted with his son or daughter, the better it is. The mother should be the first in the little one's eyes but the father should be a close second. For this, both must join in the baby's everyday existence which at first is mostly bodily care.

But even with the very young child the object to be kept in mind is independence. It must not lean on the mother solely. Nor should it be deemed permanently helpless. It is surprising how early children can learn to look after themselves. But to achieve this end requires trouble. Nevertheless, the goal of parents should be the gradual teaching of independent action, under supervision. That is, they should remember that in associating with their children they must also prepare them to fit into the world. True companionship is not selfish possession.

But physical care alone will not suffice as a basis of companionship. If it ends with this it ends abruptly when children become old enough to make their own friends. The child quite naturally turns to the one who has tended it with its first problems. This is when the mental factor enters. The child needs less bodily care but more understanding.

Both parents are needed. Many fathers gain in importance in this mental companionship. The interchange of ideas and the answering of questions open new vistas. The child is endlessly inquisitive and will take information from anybody willing to give it. The father who does not read and follow his youngsters in their quests for knowledge has thrown away a splendid opportunity for future close relationship. But the mother must not be excluded. She, too, has a mental role to fill. In fact since she is constantly with the children, she may be pressed into service more frequently. If she evades all queries by saying, "Father will tell you that," she is demeaning herself in her children's estimation. If she has not the desired information, she should acknowledge this and help her children get it.

But here again parents must remember that they are working towards an end. They must not rule their children's decisions. They should be the interpreters of the world to their children but at the same time they must stimulate independent judgment. It is just as necessary for children to think for themselves as it is for them to dress without assistance. The child who appeals to its mother about every detail is likely to grow into the adult with a suppressed personality. There is nothing more pitiful than the grown-up man or woman who cannot cut loose from his or her parents' leading strings. This is not true companionship, no matter how much time they spend together.

Parents have the responsibility of making their children into human beings who can face the world with equanimity. In order to do this, the parents must help the child adapt itself and conform to society. This is their task and it cannot be accomplished through continuous bossing and nagging. Domineering does not make for understanding, and understanding is a big part of companionship. But it is hard to establish this later in life if it has been ignored in childhood.

The growing boy and girl need tremendous sympathy. The adolescent is going through astounding changes in body and mentality. These are quite inexplicable without adult interpretation. Surging emotions cannot be explained on the basis of book knowledge; they require a personal relationship. If the parents fail here, their children may feel that they have been entirely deserted. Children have long memories for the faults of adults to which they are likely to pin their own disappointments. The connection may not be logical but it exists. This is undeniable. Parents must remember that the confidence of the child approaching manhood or womanhood is difficult to gain at best. Adolescents are supersensitive. If the parents have not succeeded in becoming their children's comrades at an earlier age, they have let slip opportunities which are well-nigh impossible to recover.

There is, then, nothing mysterious in this companionship between parents and their children. The open sesame is merely following with interest the children on their path to adulthood. It takes time and effort and a lack of selfishness on the part of the parents. Yet in the end the value is so great that it can be justified. Furthermore, such a relationship is greatly to the parents' advantage, for as they advance in years, they depend more and more on their children. They crave their company whether or not it is their due in view of past association.

But before considering this companionship between

adult sons and daughters and their parents, I want to say a word about another phase of the situation. Couples need a common interest. Their children should be a mutual responsibility. No parents who turn their youngsters over to hired help almost entirely can have that feeling of close cooperation so necessary for successful contact in the whole family group. It is only when they themselves are the true guides of their children that they realize how dependent these little ones are on them. Emotionally, children react to their parents no matter how limited their companionship. They sense the parents in the background but their sentiments may be colored by hatred as well as devotion. They resent the activities of their parents which do not allow them time to get acquainted with their own children. Nurses and governesses cannot substitute for these parents because no matter how conscientious they are, their position in the household is entirely different. They may be fine companions but they do not replace parents whom the children recognize as the arbitrators of their fate.

Parents cannot afford to let others carry their burden if they really wish a united family. This does not mean that they should carry the burden unaided. There are ways to distribute it and yet have the parents retain the major portion. But they cannot neglect it entirely, trusting to the blood tie to establish the companionship when they want it. The amount of help that they have is partly a financial problem. But it goes deeper than that. Outside enthusiasms may hold couples together but they do not knit the family circle. It is the sharing of the everyday life of the child, the mutual cooperation between the parents which is a cornerstone for real stability. I cannot believe that most parents would deliberately harm their children. But if they do not know them, they are unable to judge what hurts. This, to my mind, explains the thoughtlessness of parents who drag their children from one family into another through a series of divorces. This is true also in reference to whispered scandal about either the mother or the father which, whether founded on fact or not, wounds the child severely.

After all, the family is founded on the principle of protecting the children. The parents are the trustees of the offspring they bring into this world, working together on this common problem forms a bond of real comradeship. Marriages cannot last without this. Without children their disruption is the personal affair of the couple themselves but once children enter the picture it is a different story. They require a well-balanced environment if they are to grow up into responsible adults. To provide this is the parents' duty in so far as they are able. So often each goes his own way regardless of the other or their children. This can but lead to hardship. Therefore, the foundation of parents' companionship with their children is a contribution to the whole family life. It should prevent the parents from separating either legally or in spirit by providing a mutual interest. As this interest consists of a human equation, they quickly learn how this can be warped unless well-handled.

In all family relations the children must be of concern to their parents. This does not mean that they should worry themselves sick over them. Nor does it mean that they should give in to every whim and make them selfish brats. Neither of these methods leads towards real companionship.

The aim of parents in dealing with their children is to attach them to themselves. This should not, however, be a mere demand for attention because of consanguinity. This is what I have tried to emphasize. The result in adult life depends tremendously on the efforts put forth in the molding of the children. It seems reasonable to assume that the parent who has helped the child become an independent being will have more understanding of its nature than if participation has ceased with economic and social supervision. Each person in a family may veer to entirely different occupations, yet have the capacity to enjoy one another's companionship. The depth of feeling of which I am speaking between parents and their children has not necessarily to do with the details of existence. It is just as important for parents to realize that their children are personalities as it is to share in the tending of the dependent infant.

Ideal companionship between parents and their grown-up children must be based on the experiences of childhood. But it must also make due allowance for individual self-expression. The baby that clings like a vine to its parents must gradually be led to stand on its own feet. Comprehension of another human being's make-up does not mean agreement on all subjects. Deep companionship demands mutual respect for opposing opinions. It cannot be commanded by parents who try to enforce their own standards on their children. It is uphill work for parents to win their children's friendship. However, for those who will clamber up the path that I have shown, there is hope for the best that a truly close family relationship can bring.

Danger in the West

O. A. HAMMAND

Did the American people ever understand the significance of the Monroe Doctrine? Did they know what it was, and why it was, and what the inevitable consequences would be? In a general way it provided that America shall not be the subject of foreign colonization. The implication was that the two Americas were to be kept open for American colonization. And the reason advanced was that they shall ever be kept free for democratic development.

But it was a doctrine promoted by the people who had already come to America and was directed against those who had not yet come. There were only a few people in America when this policy was enunciated: only a few people in two great continents. Was this a group of especially choice people? Were they from any especially favored nation? Was there then and is there now any especially favored nation? Those people had come from the British Isles, from France, Spain, Middle Europe, and the Scandinavian countries. They were just the same kind of people who had been left behind, so why were those still remaining on the con-

tinent any threat to the American democracy established on this side of the Atlantic?

Yes, the colonies were English colonies, and they disagreed with England and fought a war against her and took over the territory west to the Mississippi except Florida. After this came the Monroe Doctrine. And was this doctrine a democratic policy or was it a selfish policy? Was it intended to prevent European imperialism or to promote American imperialism? Any attempt at colonization by any European or Asiatic power would be considered by the United States as an unfriendly act. Our crowd had come, had fought a war and taken a big territory away from England, and now we announced in effect that we would fight any one else who attempted colonization. There were only a few million people in the western hemisphere, and Europe and Asia were both badly crowded.

But almost half of the new country was not enough. We took Florida in three parts. The main part of the territory was bought from Spain by the United States, but it was bought under pressure and under a degree of pressure that could not be resisted. Besides none of the purchase price of $5,000,000 went to Spain, the United States simply assumed the claims which our citizens had made against Spain. Nor was the Louisiana Purchase a sale in any ordinary sense. Napoleon made plans to defend the territory, providing ships and 25,000 men. But there came an early winter and his ships were frozen up in the ice, and so first he made us a bargain offer and then again within a period of six weeks cut his own price.

Out of the Mexican War, which most historians agree was American made, we took over a territory fifteen times as big as all New England, and out of the cry, "Fifty-four Forty or Fight" we acquired the Oregon Territory. When we told Russia that we wanted to buy Alaska, Russia said "all right," and the sale was made and the American flag was run up before a cent had been paid on the purchase price. We chased the British out of the Samoan Islands, took over the best of them and let the Germans have what was left. After flirting with Queen Liliukalani for several years and bringing her to the Chicago World's Fair as our American guest, we became impatient and declared an emergency in the Hawaiian Islands, landed soldiers from the warship *Boston,* and took them over.

Just before the turn of the century we became involved in the Cuban affair and in order to save the Cubans from Spanish tyranny, we struck first in the Philippines thirteen thousand miles away. When Colombia refused to give us a right of way for a canal through Panama, we started a revolution, backed the insurgents and got the canal; and eighteen years later, when American lawyers (one of them from my home town) were in Colombia dickering for oil, America softened up and gave Colombia $25 million as adjusted compensation. We have now spread out all over the Caribbean and the Atlantic and are now saying to the United Nations and to the whole world, like it or not, "we are taking over 623 islands in the Pacific with substantial rights of ownership."

The excuse given is that we have expended great treasure and loss of life in conquering these islands, and therefore we should have them; or in other words that war is a legitimate business and the lands are the property of those who are strong enough to take them. It may be that this is the old rule of international law in a dog-eat-dog society, but I thought that we claimed to be a democracy and stood for new ideals and law, order, and peace. I thought we had added morality to our other virtues and had decided to repudiate selfishness and bitterness and hate, and take steps toward friendship and fellowship and brotherhood.

There is room enough in this world for all of us if we make the proper adjustments, but the line where conflicting Monroe Doctrines meet is a danger spot, and international relations must be conducted with deliberation, thoughtfulness, and care.

G. G. Coulton: Historian and Humanist

F. H. AMPHLETT MICKLEWRIGHT

The death of Dr. G. G. Coulton at Cambridge early in March, 1947, is a serious loss both to medieval studies and to liberal religion as a whole. Dr. Coulton had reached the advanced age of eighty-nine years and had long retired from his university lectureship but he was active to the last, corresponding upon points of interest with old pupils and friends. During the war years, he had occupied a visiting professorship at Toronto University and he was in close touch with the medieval studies undertaken at Chicago. His autobiography, *Fourscore Years,* was both the story of the evolution of a historian and also a testament of faith which charted the approach of a liberal religionist to the problem of truth. Certainly he occupied a distinctive position in the world of scholarship, and his services to a Humanist view of the evolution of humanity, especially in terms of the Middle Ages, will be missed by all desirous of an objective study of a disputed period. Coulton was concerned in the last resort with the evolution of human happiness and with the relationship of his specialist findings to life in the world of today. His social attitude was that of a consistent academic liberal, occupied more with the preservation of human values and with rights to individuality than with the reconstruction of the economic or political system. It was this concern which made him one of the outstanding English Humanists of his generation.

Born in 1858, the son of a country town solicitor, Coulton was a child of East Anglia. As a youth, he had learned to appreciate and to grow interested in the medieval remains of King's Lynn, his native town. The interest was quickened at Cambridge and he was expected to do well in his academic studies, an expectation which was wrecked by illness during his last year at the university and consequently by a poor degree. Turning aside, Coulton took holy orders in the Church of England and served as curate at a country town near London. As a young clergyman, he quickly found that he had mistaken his vocation. The narrow limits of an orthodox theology were unable to restrain his restless intellect and he had soon passed over into the ranks of the heretics. For Coulton, every man has a glimpse of truth, the glimpses vary from man to man and elude dogmatic definition. This outlook, although very acceptable to a modern culture, is far

removed from the official theology of the Thirty-nine Articles, and Coulton found it necessary to leave the Church. For a while, he was a master at various schools, using the vacations for study and travel. Long periods on the Continent of Europe enlarged his intellectual interests enormously, while quickening his historical leanings and his medieval studies. Finally, he secured a tutoring post which gave him time for research and for university extension lecturing. Moving after a while to Cambridge, he became accepted by the university as one of its outstanding intellectual figures. At his death, he had received honorary degrees from many universities and the tribute of the honorary fellowship from two Cambridge colleges.

Quite early in his career, Coulton had been drawn to the specialist study of the rise and decline of monasticism with especial reference to the fourteenth century. His historical reading had warned him against the example of the famous Lord Acton who was so deep in research that he failed to write anything of his own. Before he returned to Cambridge, Coulton had written *From St. Francis to Dante* and his literary output increased with the years. *Art and the Reformation* is a long and scholarly study going far to weaken the story that medieval art was the child of clericalist influences and pointing out that the monks made use of master-craftsmen whom they employed to build for them. In *The Inquisition and Liberty,* Coulton wrote a judicious study of the rise and decline of the famous clerical law court which lingered on in Spain until the last century. Coulton had given a great deal of close attention to the actual social life of the Middle Ages, and *The Mediaeval Village* is one of his more important and ambitious studies in this field. Even medieval Latin did not escape his attention and *Europe's Apprenticeship* is a delightful introduction to the subject. But Coulton will always be remembered for his *magnum opus,* the volumes of the *Five Centuries of Religion,* a close and exact study of the age of Benedict and Francis. Three volumes of this great work are in print and two exist in manuscript, deposited for safety at the University of Chicago. It is to be hoped that they will also be printed as soon as opportunity allows. Incidentally, Coulton contributed a scholarly and critical paper on the Franciscan miracles to Kirsopp Lake's *Beginnings of Christianity* in which he drew the parallel between the evolution of miracle stories in the early Church and during the Middle Ages.

Quite early in his career as a medievalist, Coulton discovered that the field was the especial preserve of the Roman Catholic historians who were anxious to use it in order to illustrate the moral and social superiority of the "ages of faith" over the modern world. An early antagonist was Abbot (afterwards Cardinal) Gasquet, at that time the leading English Roman Catholic historian, Coulton was shocked at the misuse of history by this clericalist writer. In *The Old English Bible* and again in *Henry VIII and the English Monasteries,* Gasquet had wilfully perverted sources in order to justify his Church in its crusades against Wycliffe and against the later reformers. His thesis turned on the suggestion that monastic decline dated from the plague of 1348 when the Black Death swept across Europe and decimated the population. As a result, inferior men were ordained into the ranks of the clergy, and corruption penetrated both the secular clerics and the monks. Unfortunately for Gasquet, it was possible to show that clerical immorality was rife a century before the Black Death and that the plague only hastened a process which had caused an outcry among many of the laity. But Coulton was genuinely shocked that a clerical author could have so little regard for objective truth when the good of his Church was at stake. His controversy with Gasquet was long and bitter, directed to exposing the Roman Catholic author's blunders in scholarship and to the defense of academic standards in historiography. Writing years afterwards in his autobiography, Coulton found it possible in retrospect to shake hands with the shade of many an old antagonist. But there was one that, even at a long distance of time, he could never forgive. Cardinal Gasquet had offended far too greatly against a sense of academic values for Coulton to overlook his shortcomings.

From this time, Coulton became widely known as a controversialist in all questions concerning the Roman Catholic Church. A long series of *Medieval Studies,* at first printed privately and afterwards reissued by the Cambridge University Press, included many an onslaught against misconceptions of medieval religion and modern perversions made in the interests of the Roman Catholic Hierarchy. For example, it was Coulton who recalled that St. Thomas Aquinas believed one of the joys of the blessed in Heaven to be the contemplation of the sufferings of the damned in Hell and who pointed out that the most world-renouncing exaggerations of the Puritan movement in Protestantism had their forerunner in the Benedictine revival. His studies carried him forward into a consideration of modern Roman Catholic doctrine. Coulton came to the defense of Lord Strickland when he believed that he was wrongly attacked by the Roman Catholic ecclesiastics while Governor of Malta, although a Roman Catholic himself. In a famous debate with Fr. Hugh Pope, O.P., Coulton did much to demolish the historical foundations of the modern doctrine of Papal infallibility. A discussion with Canon Villiers of Birmingham Cathedral elicited the surprising fact, when measured by modern Roman Catholic claims, that the reservation of the Sacrament as practised in the modern Roman Catholic Church was unknown during a thousand years of Christian history. Fr. Thurston, Fr. Walker, and Fr. Rickaby were among the prominent English Jesuits who probably wished that they had never measured swords with Dr. Coulton.

Twenty years ago, the attitude of the Roman Catholic archbishop and a local controversy concerning mixed marriages led the then Church of England bishop to invite Dr. Coulton to lecture in Liverpool. His published lectures, *In Defence of the Reformation,* are a masterpiece and form a brilliant defense of the making of modern Europe and the formative influences of Protestantism against the superficial and childish attacks which have been produced during recent years by Roman Catholic and High Church authors. Coulton followed the great Unitarian historian, Dr. Beard, in his view that the Reformation was a movement of which the effects are still to be felt today. But he carried the argument backwards to the thirteenth century and pointed out that the Renaissance of the age of Dante and Aquinas was the beginning of an intellectual disturbance which was to end in the upheavals of the sixteenth century. The high ancestry of Humanism was to be seen in these beginnings of the recovery of a culture lying beyond the borders of orthodox theology. Incidentally, Coulton pointed out

once again that the corruptions of the medieval Church were not the product of a disaster but in fact accompanied it throughout its history and grew up with it. He afterwards produced the two volumes of *Romanism and Truth* and the lengthy work, *Papal Infallibility,* as a counterblast to Papal propaganda. Coulton continued to work at this theme until the end. In 1945, when a brilliant Roman Catholic priest, Dr. A. V. Simcox, severed his connection with the church largely through the misuse of history by its authoritative spokesmen, Dr. Coulton was once again drawn into a sharp controversy and made some interesting comments in Simcox's pamphlet, *Is the Roman Catholic Church a Secret Society?* It was Coulton's last battle and within a year he was dead.

Attempts of many kinds were made to belittle Coulton. Only the more foolhardy and ignorant controversialists attempted to challenge his scholarship, always a risky proceeding. But it was suggested very widely that he was a man "with a bee in his bonnet" who could not leave the Roman Catholic Church alone. It is a foolish judgment, for Coulton was merely dealing with the outstanding social phenomenon in his chosen period. He was concerned to show that the Middle Ages were a definite phase in the development of Europe, possessing strong and weak points in its culture and its civilization, but that man had evolved beyond an age of intolerant dogmatism, making use of the secular arm to enforce its decisions, an age which degraded women and gave currency to witchcraft beliefs as well as encouraging the more abject forms of superstition. Clearly, an age of this kind was not a desirable parallel for the modern world. During recent years, a somewhat slapdash school of writers had come into being, who sought to justify the Middle Ages through the method of dogmatic assertion. G. K. Chesterton and Hilaire Belloc were among the best known of writers of this type, lacking in exact research or accuracy of statement but rejoicing in flaming colors dashed across the canvas. Coulton was riled and made battle. He was essentially an academic figure and his long training had taught him that Clio is a jealous muse and demands exact discipleship of her votaries. His long years of exact application to the medieval chronicles and other contemporary sources showed to him the fallacies of this type of writing. The "merrie England" of Chesterton and Belloc never existed and Coulton was concerned, as an accurate scholar, to illustrate the fact. If his writing was at times vitriolic, his opponents certainly deserved to receive the vitriol for their many unscholarly blunders and half-truths. It was Dean Inge who once said that he found contact with Roman Catholics difficult; they had other standards of truth and honor than those usually followed by English gentlemen. Coulton's encounters with the Chesterton-Belloc school of writers seemed to underline the point so far as historical accuracy is concerned. The disciples of "the last relic of the Roman Empire sitting amidst the ruins thereof" had no cause to be proud of their champions. Superficial sneers and abusive writing were weapons of no value against the learned pieces of research by which Dr. Coulton underlined his point again and again.

It was a concern for historical truth that led Coulton to undertake the defense of H. C. Lea, the well-known Philadelphia medievalist, against Fr. Thurston. Lea made a certain number of blunders but they did not invalidate his pictures of the Inquisition and of clerical celibacy as they were drawn by this remarkable scholar. It was on the initiative of Lord Acton himself that Lea had received the high compliment of an invitation to contribute to the *Cambridge Modern History.* When, long after Lea's death, his memory was traduced in the interests of Roman Catholic propaganda, it was Coulton who hurried to the defense. He was a disciple of truth who was anxious to picture the Middle Ages as they actually were and his controversial writings, such as *Sectarian History,* in which Lea is defended, were in no way lacking in the scholarship which appears in the calm impartiality of *Scottish Abbeys and Social Life,* a work which contains a picture of many of the strong points of Scottish monasticism.

The great contribution which Coulton made to culture was in terms of Humanism. He was concerned with man and with human values as they appear among individuals, a fact to which many old pupils and hearers could testify. It was one of these, Mr. Kingsley Martin, editor of the *New Statesman and Nation,* who referred to Dr. Coulton at his death as being "in personal intercourse the kindest of saints." As a young man, Coulton had experienced in his own life the failure of theological dogmatism as a personal creed acceptable to the mind attuned to the discovery of truth. His own personal religion remained of a theistic type and it is possibly true to say that, in an entirely non-denominational sense, it was Unitarian as much as anything. But his view of God was universal and it was of a type which saw the highest acts of the Divine revelation as appearing under the guise of human values. Coulton had learned of the Humanists of the sixteenth century Renaissance and he applied the message of Colet and Erasmus to the twentieth century. In December, 1929, he contributed to *The Realist* a moving little essay, "Modern Faith," which is in essence a plea for a Humanist religion growing out of the Christian tradition. Although he had a certain sympathy with the great figures of his period, such as St. Bernard and St. Benedict, he realized that his whole conception of faith was other than that which they had accepted. In the last resort, ecclesiastical authority and theological dogmatism are challenged by a conception of faith arising out of a world whose culture is governed by scientific methods of comparison and experiment. Coulton's historical research had succeeded in underlining one vital point relevant to the explorations of the Humanist of today. Human happiness and cooperation were not ends facilitated by either the piety or the theology of "the Ages of Faith." On the contrary, medieval religion produced a next-worldliness and a dogmatic frame of mind which made against these things. The modern Humanist is not robbing man of faith, as some Roman Catholic authors have had the impertinence to suggest. He is concerned with the destruction of a theological culture which has made for human misery and for the spread of pain and sorrow through its lack of tolerance and of understanding. Marriage and divorce form only one of the many problems which could be discussed in this light. Coulton's vast scholarship was turned to the evoking of a Humanist approach to life and it is therefore of a wider importance than as the property of the specialist historian.

But Coulton was a specialist historian whose years had been spent upon investigation of contemporary sources. He was concerned with the accuracy and re-

gard for objective truth which has turned modern historical investigation into a science. Although he wrote works of considerable readability and was not merely the compiler of "literary pantechnicons"—a charge once brought against E. A. Freeman—he had learned his methods of historical study from Stubbs and the school of historians who insisted upon minute investigation. As a result, he reached a high standard of accuracy and a careful regard for truth. Coulton soon learned that this method is not congenial to an ecclesiastical manner of writing history where facts must be bent to fit dogmas or where great world movements, such as the Reformation, must be distorted and colored falsely in order to represent something which in point of fact they did not represent at all. Likewise, he had followed the latter-day precedent of abandoning any attempt to become a polymorphous scholar and of concentrating upon the century of his choice. As a result, he formed a challenge to the slapdash style of writing, hiding a serious lack of perspective and accuracy, by which ecclesiastical views were conveyed to the multitude in a popularized and superficial manner. Coulton, within his own sphere, did much to illustrate Dr. Johnson's remark that the greatest thing in the world is truth, a judgment in which he would probably have agreed with the lexicographer. His additions to the store of human learning will go far towards supporting the Humanist case as the disciple of a present day scientific Humanism seeks to define his reactions towards important formative periods of European thought and history. But, now that he has gone, it will perhaps be natural to those who most valued him to think of Coulton as pre-eminently the disciple of truth. He taught all who were concerned with the human story to learn to value truth as Dante valued the universal light in Paradise: "Such at that light doth man become that to turn thence to any other sight could not by possibility be ever yielded."

The Three Great Powers

DEVERE ALLEN

Great Britain is allegedly on the skids, and the Soviet radio as well as conservative papers in the United States have not been slow to point it out. But Russia also is very weak, as numerous British and American observers constantly make clear. And the United States is due for economic trouble, is hamstrung by inflation, and is politically divided—as British and Russian commentators, along with those of many other countries, cheerfully suggest.

Such solicitude is touching. The position of Great Britain is far from secure, but one thing must be noted, and that is the frankness with which her own economists and officials have been speaking. There is, in outside countries, an odd twist to some of the comments being made. Instead of praising the British for withdrawing from India and Burma, for trying to pull out of dominance over Egypt and still protect the interests of the anti-Egyptian Sudanese, some of the very people who long assailed British imperialism are now bewailing the collapse of the empire, and writing it down to weakness pure and simple. It looks as if the Labor Government were to be damned when it acts imperialistically, and equally damned when it does not.

A popular attitude of cynicism on the part of those who are afraid of British Socialism can be understood. But when soberly analyzed, the British situation seems to show one thing, at any rate: that the crisis would have been far worse had not the Labor Party been in power, had it not taken over by strong controls, had it not met an underlying, inherited crisis with measures its enemies would never have used. If it has failed, its failure appears at the points where it was timid in using governmental power; for example, electricity and coal should probably have been rationed long ago. Inside Britain, while conservatives have found fault with a variety of current steps, they have generally recognized that the trouble is largely a result of war, and that the tired and futile Tory Party has no remedy whatsoever.

Prophecy is dangerous in a world which is as mixed as this one. But American and Russian spokesmen would do well to go a little slow before consigning Britain to the place of a third-rate country. That peculiar form of British power that ruled the waves is certainly waning; but in the world toward which we move, this may become an element of strength. If the British future is shaky, it behooves the outside world to leave detailed criticisms to internal critics, not to leap upon every setback as final catastrophe.

Russian weakness is also worthy of attention. To foes of the Soviet system, and especially to those who rightly deplore the type of Russian expansionist nationalism now making policies at the Kremlin, it is natural to pounce on signs of weakness. But inside criticism speaks loudly. No sooner does the Moscow microphone cease vibrating from the usual attacks on British and American weakness, than it speaks stridently of home shortcomings. It definitely does not mention the Russian quarrels behind the scenes with Tito, a difficulty nearly as great as that of Britain with Egypt. But it does speak openly of internal shortcomings.

The breakdown of housing programs in the Urals and the Don Basin has been a source of bitter scolding from top government spokesmen. Coal production is overall back to the prewar level, but in some places, according to the official *Pravda,* it is only 8.7 per cent of prewar output. Shipbuilding is down to 14 per cent of the goal set by the latest Plan. Tractor crankshafts are down to 14 per cent. Yet Russian prestige is high throughout the colonial areas of the world because of the Soviet attitude against race prejudice.

The United States of course is geared to tremendous productivity. Our national weakness does not lie in that direction. But our racist habits are anathema to much of the world. Our current inflation bids fair to become disastrous unless soon checked, and other nations watch fearfully to see with what convulsions the checking process may be accompanied. Our political instability is apparent to everybody but ourselves. When Mr. Churchill censures the Labor Government, he gets a big play in our press; when the Labor leftists jump on the Attlee government, Moscow gives three cheers. But all indications are that in an election held today, the Labor Party would be returned by a large vote. Mean-

time, the Gallup Poll shows that 51 per cent of the American people would now vote Democratic. In short, Uncle Sam is no more stable and surefooted than are other countries.

Such factors are not the only ones, of course, which shape the power of nations. There are countless others, which in a brief account like this cannot be mentioned. But one thing is sure. American and Russian attacks on British weakness, British and Russian attacks on American weakness, British and American attacks on Russian weakness, lose much of their force when the whole world picture is examined. The world today is dominated by three giants. They vary day to day in strength and outreach. But each and every one of them is sick.

One strength could be relied on, in each instance, to save the future. That is the strength which might accrue to all of the three if they could make a genuine peace; if they could cease the fruitless job of trying to undermine each other; if they could join in common efforts for the common welfare. The enemy of each is nationalism—nationalism of the others, but particularly nationalism of its own. The constant gloating over weakness conjures up a sort of allegorical scene, in which three venturesome canoeists are trying to get through a dangerous rapid. Nothing can induce them to take their eyes off the menacing sharp rocks which lie ahead—except that they all, when one of them falls down, double over in happy laughter.

A Record Year for Consumer Cooperatives

WALLACE J. CAMPBELL

Nineteen forty-six was a record year—measured in cooperative business, membership, and production. But in spite of growing retail and wholesale volumes which made consumer co-ops a billion dollar business, and the acquisition of many new productive plants (particularly new oil properties), yet the one word which characterized the year was "organization."

During the year just closed, three new national cooperative organizations were formed: the National Cooperative Mutual Housing Association; the Cooperative Health Federation of America; and the North American League of Student Cooperatives.

National Cooperatives, formerly just a business federation of consumer and purchasing cooperatives in the United States and Canada, added education and publicity departments to create a new Organization Division and made plans for an enlarged financial division.

At the same time the Cooperative League of the U.S.A., which had devoted a major part of its activities to education and promotion of commodity cooperatives, transferred these functions to National Cooperatives and "moved upstairs" to become an all-inclusive federation of cooperatives in the fields of housing, medical care, commodity, credit, insurance, banking, utility, recreation, and student cooperatives.

In the international field it was a year of *re-organization*. The International Cooperative Alliance held its first postwar Congress in Zurich with delegates from 22 nations participating in deliberations designed to shape world cooperative policy. Co-ops with 85 million family members are associated with the I.C.A. which is a permanent consultant of the United Nations Economic and Social Council. The International Cooperative Trading Agency, which absorbed the old International Cooperative Wholesale Society, mobilized to re-enter the field of inter-cooperative trade and to expand its activities all along the line.

Most dramatic of all the year-long activities was the organization of the International Cooperative Petroleum Association, which will be the most important step of the World Co-ops to date in matching strength with the world's monopolies. Even while the I.C.P.A. was being formed, co-op oil from U. S. consumer cooperatives was being shipped to co-ops in Sweden, France, Netherlands, South Africa, Australia, China, and other countries.

Reports on total co-op business for 1946 are still fragmentary, but there is every indication that volume of business of the commodity co-ops will be well above the 1945 record. Regionals affiliated with National Cooperatives did a business of $178 million through 20 regionals. Two new regionals—British Columbia Cooperative Wholesale and Tennessee Farmers Cooperative Association—were added during the year. It is safe to predict that the 1946 business of these regionals passed the $200,000,000 mark. Business of affiliated retail co-ops was reported for the first time in 1945 at an estimated $609,000,000. The same percentage increase should have pushed this figure over seven hundred million dollars.

This, of course, represents only commodity cooperative business through co-ops with 1½ million family members. Nearly a million additional families are members of co-ops which are not yet affiliated with National Cooperatives. Taken all together, consumer cooperative business, both farm and city, in the distribution of commodities is conservatively estimated at over a billion dollars.

Cooperative housing drew the spotlight in the field of consumer cooperative services. Part of this was due to the formation of the National Cooperative Mutual Housing Association mentioned above. More than a hundred veterans' cooperative housing associations were organized during the year. Only a few of them actually started construction before the year's end. Outstanding among the general consumer cooperative housing projects—on the drawing boards with land purchased and everything set for construction in 1947—are co-ops in New York, Washington D. C., Twin Cities, Chicago (leading with 7 projects), Palo Alto, West Haven, Racine, South Bend, New Brunswick, N. J., and a number of other communities.

A better prospect of more cooperative housing is given in the change of business regulations which permits mixed veteran and non-veteran groups to build.

In the area around Chicago, co-op housing groups from several states formed the North Central States Cooperative Housing Association, which will be the first regional housing association.

Several regional commodity co-ops have building supply departments and there are four lumber mills and over 300 co-op lumber yards available to supply

building materials. Eastern Cooperative League set up a full-time housing department.

Formation of the Cooperative Health Federation of America followed several years of active work in the development of cooperative hospitals and health associations. Six cooperative hospitals are in operation and forty more are in the process of organization. A score of cooperative health associations also served as a nucleus of the new national association. The Group Health Cooperative in Seattle merged with the Medical Securities Clinic and St. Luke's Hospital to operate a 50-bed hospital near the end of the year, and construction got underway on a co-op clinic in Sandpoint, Idaho. The Northwest Cooperative Health Federation came into being early in the year and a provincial health federation was organized in Ontario in September.

In a field not too far removed, the Iowa cooperative burial associations won a unanimous decision when the state supreme court handed down a decision which clears the co-ops of legal barriers to operation in the state.

There are eleven cooperative burial associations in Iowa and at least thirty more in other sections of the country, performing a very valuable cooperative service.

It is too early to have statistics yet on cooperative insurance developments, but the Farm Bureau Mutual Automobile Insurance Company and its two associated Life and Fire Insurance cooperatives, reported that assets have topped $38,000,000 and business is at the highest peak in history.

Toward the year's end, steps were being taken to mutualize the Cooperators Life Association in Minneapolis. This organization is one of five cooperative insurance companies under joint management serving Minnesota and Wisconsin. Preliminary reports indicated a record volume in those states.

Credit Unions throughout the United States continued to grow after having suffered minor set-backs during the war period, due to credit restrictions and an increased availability of cash. With more than three and a half million members, these credit unions have assets of over $350,000,000. The credit cooperatives are still far ahead of other forms of cooperative organizations in terms of number of members served.

One of the outstanding developments in the field of production was the purchase of coal mining properties in Kentucky by Ohio Farm Bureau, Indiana Farm Bureau, and Midland Cooperative Wholesale cooperatives, which made an investment in coal properties of $100,000 and incorporated the Miller's Creek Coal Cooperative. They leased 6,000 acres of coal land in Kentucky. Twelve million tons of coal are estimated to lie in the property and will take thirty years to mine.

Oil production facilities continue to lead the field. At the year's end, Consumers Cooperative Association purchased the Bridgeport Oil Company which has 64,000 net acres of undeveloped oil and gas leases and 39 producing leases with 86 producing oil and gas wells on them.

Earlier in the year Midland Cooperative Wholesale purchased 440 acres of oil-producing properties in the rich Seminole field in Oklahoma. The property includes 21 producing wells with a capacity of about 1,600 barrels of crude oil daily. The Cooperative Refinery Association, owned by Consumers Cooperative Association, acquired oil leases on 300 acres in Montgomery County, Kansas, and 1,860 acres in Okmulgee County, Oklahoma, and now has nearly 100 square miles of oil land under its control. On the new Kansas properties of the Cooperative Refinery Association, are twelve stripper wells. During the year the organization drilled more than thirty new wells with only two being dry holes. During the same period, the Farmers Union Central Exchange acquired four producing wells in Montana and a half interest in five additional oil wells.

The Indiana Farm Bureau Cooperative Association completed an $800,000 cracking plant as an addition to its refinery at Mt. Vernon, Indiana, and stepped up production to 4,000 barrels daily.

Consumers Cooperative Association in Kansas City let the contract for installation of a furfural process plant at its lubricating oil refinery in Coffeyville, Kansas. The plant will cost $600,000, and improvements calling for an additional $400,000 have been approved.

A $200,000 fertilizer plant was being built at Eagle Grove, Iowa, by the Consumers Cooperative Association at the end of the year.

Other smaller production facilities acquired included several feed mills, several small food processing plants, and a substantial addition to the hot water heater factory, run as a section of the Co-op Universal Milking Machine Factory, owned by National Cooperatives.

During the year, also, National Cooperatives took over ownership of the Cooperative Mill at Auburn, Indiana, tying it in with the National Production program already underway.

A survey completed just at the close of the year showed that cooperatives affiliated with National Cooperatives, Inc., in the United States and Canada owned and operated 179 productive facilities including oil refineries, mills, factories, mines, and processing plants. This did not include more than 500 oil wells and over 1,600 miles of pipe line.

The Study Table

Symbol of Tragedy

WHAT MUST THE CHURCH DO? *The Interseminary Series, Vol. V. By Robert S. Bilheimer. New York: Harper & Bros. 120 pp. $1.00.*

The purpose of this book is to summarize and interpret the implications of four previous volumes of The Interseminary Series. The author's summary of the preceding foursome (*The Challenge of Our Culture; The Church and Organized Movements; The Gospel, the Church and the World; Toward World-Wide Christianity*) is adequate to illustrate vividly the dilemma of modernist Protestantism. In analyzing the challenge of our culture the best minds of the modernists are capable of doing a thoroughly objective, incisive, and candid job. No one oriented to a scientific interpretation of contemporary social phenomena would deny The Interseminary Series thesis that the essence of the challenge of our culture breaks down into four

definable categories: obsession with economic achievement; the dominance of groups, and their rivalry for power; the substitution of a mechanical for a spiritual unity; personal tensions leading toward disastrous rather than creative life.

The dilemma referred to above rears its theological head, however, when one confronts the amalgamation of out-of-this-world conclusions drawn by the author in the full glare of our culture's challenge.

Concluding his discussion of the substitution of a mechanical for a spiritual unity in our common life the author huffs and puffs and comes forth with the following: "Most important, however, is our loss of cosmic ties. Our society does not live in devotion to God. Our age has lost its roots of faith. . ." In considering the personal tensions leading toward disastrous rather than creative life, the author blandly concludes that "without faith in God both individual and society will never fail to show the symptoms of mental disease."

Here, most assuredly, are the makings of a semanticist's nightmare. If the author thinks this sort of sophistry is an answer to our culture's challenge he might be able to get a lucrative position ghost-writing Henry Luce's editorials on religion, but he will be of little use in solving a plain citizen's problems in the atomic era.

Similar illustrations of this book's doctrinaire violations of both logic and realism could be multiplied indefinitely. But to what avail? This book symbolizes one of the great tragedies of our time.

Protestant churchmen, even of the modernist stripe, have learned to ask answerable questions about contemporary man and his life, but they do so only as a kind of window-dressing for the *a priori* answers snugly and unassailably tucked within the folds of their shrouded theology. The ventriloquistic method of this book (which we may safely assume to be the approved technique of The Interseminary Series) will do little to help us solve our problems. Not only must we ask answerable questions about our present condition, also we must honestly and courageously seek the answers which truly derive from the questions themselves. This Volume V of The Interseminary Series fails to do.

JACK MENDELSOHN, JR.

An Exciting Novel

GENTLEMEN'S AGREEMENT. *By Laura Z. Hobson. New York: Simon & Schuster. $2.75.*

This is a novel that is as exciting as it is important. It is a sensational book and will most certainly be on the best-seller lists for a long time.

This reviewer agrees with James Grey that "if Laura Hobson's novel were to reach everyone for whom it is intended, the audience would exceed that of *Gone with the Wind.*"

Phil Green is a young journalist who has been given an assignment on a liberal weekly. His job is to deal with prejudice. He wonders how to find some new approach. He finally decides that for a certain length of time he will become a Jew. The title of his series of articles is "I Was a Jew for Eight Weeks."

Miss Hobson succeeds in helping every reader to live the experiences of Phil Green. With him you will learn the harrowing truth about injustices and intolerance.

JAMES M. YARD.

Civil Liberties

THE CONSTITUTION AND CIVIL RIGHTS. *By Milton R. Konvitz. New York: Columbia University Press. 254 pp. $3.00.*

THE ALIEN AND THE ASIATIC IN AMERICAN LAW. *By Milton R. Konvitz. Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell University Press. 299 pp. $3.00.*

Justice should not be identified with the courts any more than religion should be identified with the Church. Yet Konvitz in these two encyclopedic volumes shows how the courts and legislatures of the nation have slowly yet persistently increased many areas of justice toward minorities. The author rightly says that "freedom comes only from the law; but not all law gives freedom." Indeed the laws of many states, and apparently of the nation, sanction discrimination.

Some time ago Carey McWilliams told how, somewhere in the South, separate Bibles are provided in court, so that Negroes and whites may swear to the same God on a separate copy of the identical text. Konvitz tells of the Georgia statute which prohibits a Negro minister from marrying a white couple. That brings to mind the recent reported decision of the Attorney General of Kentucky who refused to rule on whether the state's jim crow laws apply to churches since to do so would be to interfere with the historic separation of church and state!

The Constitution and Civil Rights treats not the general area of civil liberties but that technically limited field of the accommodation of persons to public places and carriers (including a more recent extension of the concept to the right to employment without discrimination). Konvitz discusses in detail the little-known history of the adoption of the federal civil rights acts and of their emasculation by the courts until today "only a small part of the statutes remain in force and . . . those that remain are a slender reed for the proclamation of liberty."

Eighteen states have some kind of a civil rights act. In most of these states the act applies to all persons (but only to citizens in California) who are discriminated against because of race or color (or religion in New York) and often it provides for both civil and criminal action. The public places explicitly mentioned in these statutes include cemeteries (New Jersey), golf courses (New York), escalators (Michigan), and race courses (California). Most of these acts broadly apply to eating places, hotels, public carriers, and other public places. Besides discussing the legal history of these state laws, Konvitz in a long appendix gives a model civil rights statute recommended by the American Civil Liberties Union, excerpts from the existing civil rights laws of sixteen states, and the text of the recent fair employment practice laws enacted in New York, New Jersey, and Massachusetts.

Professor Konvitz' earlier volume, *The Alien and the Asiatic in American Law,* is more technical but no less important. It gives detailed court decisions on the right of the United States to exclude aliens and expel them, the right or privilege of aliens becoming citizens and remaining citizens, the right of aliens to work, own land, and share in the natural resources. There is a short chapter on the law of miscegenation affecting others than Negroes and whites. The final chapter describes the important cases affecting Americans of Japanese ancestry in World War II—and thus affect-

ing every American believing in civil liberties in a democracy.

HOMER A. JACK.

Negro Life

JIM CROW IN AMERICA. *By Earl Conrad. New York: Duell, Sloan & Pearce, Inc. 237 pp. $3.00.*

If you would like to know how the American Negro lives, what he thinks, and how he got that way, this is your book.

Conrad gives you history in the raw—the slave revolts and "the Great Migration" of recent years. There is an interesting chapter on the Negro Press and an eye opener on "Inside the White Press." If you are interested in freedom of the press, you should read that chapter. That together with a recent book on our Free Press published by the University of Chicago will give you the jitters. Of course, if you are afraid to know what goes on in American journalism, do not read either book.

Earl Conrad has been a newspaper man for twenty-five years. He knows his way about. I recommend him as a guide.

JAMES M. YARD.

Books Received

FABRIC OF MY LIFE. *By Hannah G. Solomon. Published by Bloch Publishing Company, 26 E. 22d Street, New York City. 263 pp. $2.50.*

GOD'S BOYCOTT OF SIN. *By Rachel H. King. Published by Fellowship Publications, 2929 Broadway, New York City. 122 pp. Paper cover $1.25. Cloth-bound volume $2.00.*

THE MEANING OF EXISTENCE. *By Charles Duell Kean. Published by Harper & Brothers, 49 E. 33d Street, New York City. 222 pp. $3.00.*

THE NOBLE VOICE. *By Mark Van Doren. Published by Henry Holt & Company, 1 Park Avenue, New York City. 328 pp. $3.00.*

NOW IS THE TIME TO PREVENT A THIRD WORLD WAR. *By Kirby Page. Published by Kirby Page, La Habra, California. 123 pp. Paper cover $1.00. Cloth-bound volume $2.50.*

OF GUILT AND HOPE. *By Martin Niemoeller. Published by Philosophical Library, 15 E. 40th Street, New York City. 79 pp. $2.00.*

REFUGEES IN AMERICA. *By Maurice R. Davie. Published by Harper & Brothers, 49 E. 33d Street, New York City. 453 pp. $4.50.*

Correspondence

Generosity Toward Niemoeller

TO UNITY:

After I had read those three highly interesting and so spirited contributions to the "Niemoeller theme" in February's UNITY, the thought came to me that the time may have arrived when we should "lay off Niemoeller." Let me put my suggestion in this variation of two famous lines from *Macbeth:*

> Lay off Macduff,
> The fight was good, we both have had enough.

I believe I was among the first in America to voice strenuous opposition to Niemoeller's coming to America, and I recant nothing that as early as the summer of 1945 and since I have said and written about him. It seems to me that in this whole exchange in *l'affaire Niemoeller,* the opposition to the German pastor has received by far the better part of the argument; and I take it that the victor can afford to be generous. After all, we *did* warn the Niemoellerites against bringing their idol to America before either he or America was quite ready for this face-to-face encounter. Since Niemoeller's partisans were so anxious to bring him here prematurely, they have only themselves to blame if both they and their "German saint and martyr" have been embarrassed by the simple facts that the clay feet and other plaster parts of the Saint so quickly became apparent and that the Martyr himself "exposed" some of his past by admitting that in Sachsenhausen and Dachau he had been "a special prisoner" to whom even the Commandant of Dachau, a place not exactly noted for its cordiality, "was always very cordial."

But I repeat, I believe the time has come when we can afford to be a bit generous. Not that I counsel an easy policy of "forgive and forget." I am willing to forgive Niemoller much, but I suggest that we withhold "forgetting" until time has spoken a more authentic word upon the theme of Niemoeller's penitence and that of his people. At any rate, we should give him a real chance to make good his strong protestations of "guilt and penitence" which have so often come from his lips during his public addresses here. Let us wait and see whether this "feeling of guilt and repentance," which Niemoeller seems to think is being shared by a large portion of religious Germany, is genuine, or whether all this talk has been only wishful thinking on the part of Niemoller or clever propaganda on the part of his American press agents.

After all, "there is great joy in heaven," etc., and, I might add, "on earth," over one sinner that repents; why not give this man a chance to prove the genuineness of his conversion from Nazism to decency and true religion? We *do* need someone in Germany in whom both we and the decent German remnant may put their trust. If Niemoller's friends will only stop trying to whitewash Niemoeller's past, I am quite willing to ask his enemies to lay aside their tarbrushes. At present it seems as though the German clergyman had experienced a real change of heart; he has already aroused the enmity of many in Germany, who refuse to recognize either Hitler or his crazy ideology as the ultimate cause of their defeat. If Niemoeller's repentance is genuine, if it indicates what millions of other German people may be feeling, we shall have in this representative of a penitent and regenerated people a strong champion of those forces which, we believe, can alone save Germany and the world.

The prosecution and the defense have had their innings. Now let the jury, i.e. world opinion, pronounce its verdict; and will any of us, even those of us who were Niemoeller's severest critics, resent the verdict if it should read, "this man has found himself; give him a chance, and he may lead his people back to faith in God and the service of man"?

KARL M. CHWOROWSKY.

Brooklyn, New York.

Western Conference News

RANDALL S. HILTON, Executive Secretary
700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago 15, Illinois

THE 95TH ANNUAL SESSIONS

The 95th annual sessions of the Western Unitarian Conference were held at the Third Unitarian Church, in Chicago, May 9-11, 1947. Delegates were present from Ohio to Nebraska and from Kentucky to Wisconsin. The meetings opened with a luncheon for the Alliance and the ministers. It closed with a banquet at the Bismarck Hotel in the Chicago Loop.

At the Alliance meeting Friday afternoon the speakers were Mrs. Lou H. Haycock, retiring Midwestern vice-president of the General Alliance, and Mrs. Gladys R. Hilton, the incoming vice-president. Officers' workshops were also held.

The Unitarian Ministerial Union met the same afternoon under the leadership of Dr. Thaddeus B. Clark, president of the Union. The ministers discussed proposals for reorganization of the Union, which were prepared by a special committee of the Union meeting in New York City.

Friday evening a panel discussion was held on Dr. Ernest Chave's new book *The Functional Approach to Religious Education.* Participants in the panel were Dr. Curtis W. Reese, Dr. Leslie T. Pennington, and Dr. Chave. Mrs. Hilton acted as moderator. At the Religious Education dinner preceding the evening program, Mrs. Dudley Moore presided.

At the meeting of the Western Conference branch of the Unitarian Historical Society on Saturday morning, recognition was made of the 100th anniversary of the publication of the first volume of poems by Ralph Waldo Emerson. Dr. Ralph E. Bailey presented a lecture-poem on Emerson as Poet.

Following lunch the Unitarian Fellowship for Social Justice presented two outstanding speakers on the general subject of "Liberals Face the Current Hysteria." The speakers were Dr. Curtis MacDougall, Professor of Journalism at Northwestern University, and Dr. James Luther Adams, of the Meadville Theological School. The evening meeting Saturday was addressed by Dr. Emory Balduf, Dean of Student Services at Roosevelt College, Chicago. Under the general heading of "The Liberal's Role in Improving Human Relations," Dr. Balduf stressed the particular problem of racial relations pointing up the too frequently present discrepancy between the liberal's lip service to the principle of brotherhood and practice.

Rev. Harold P. Marley, of Dayton, was the Conference preacher on Sunday morning. Rev. E. T. Buehrer, minister of Third Church, conducted the service. Mr. Marley spoke on "Living Positively." Prior to the service a discussion was held, led by Dr. Millard S. Everett, of Roosevelt College.

One of the most valuable sessions of the Conference was the two-and-a-half-hour workshop on churchmanship conducted by Mr. George G. Davis, Director of the Department of Unitarian Extension and Church Maintenance of the American Unitarian Association.

The Conference was brought to a close with a banquet at the Bismarck Hotel on Sunday night. Dr. Curtis W. Reese presided. Talks were given by Rev. Helgi Borgford, Beverly Unitarian Fellowship, Chicago; Rev. William D. Hammond, People's Liberal Church, Chicago; and Rev. Robert T. Weston, First Unitarian Church, Louisville, Kentucky. The address of the evening was given by Dr. Marshall E. Dimock, chairman of the Political Science Department of Northwestern University. His subject was "Can the Church Hold Its Own Against Power Politics?"

At the first business session on Friday afternoon the Conference considered and adopted a new set of by-laws. These were made necessary by changes in the Illinois Statutes for corporations not for profit.

At the second business session on Saturday morning the following officers and board members were elected:

President: Curtis W. Reese, Chicago.
Vice-President: E. Burdette Backus, Indianapolis.
Secretary: Randall S. Hilton, Chicago.
Treasurer: Herbert E. Clapham, Chicago.
Board Members:
Mrs. Harry C. Ormes, Minneapolis. (For unexpired term of Raymond Bragg.)
Mrs. Paul Caskey, Rockford.
Mr. Harry Burns, Cincinnati.
Rev. Grant Butler, Des Moines.

A resolution expressing appreciation to Mr. D. I. Jarrett, the retiring treasurer, for his long, loyal, and able service to the Conference was passed unanimously. Others passed at this session were concerned with thanks to the Third Church for its gracious and generous hospitality, to the committees responsible for the program and entertainment, and one approving the application of the Unitarian Fellowship for Social Justice to be included in the United Appeal.

At the third business session on Saturday afternoon resolutions on the following subjects were passed: (1) In support of the Unitarian Service Committee and its financial campaign to raise funds among non-Unitarians, (2) an affirmation of the traditional Unitarian principle of Freedom of Belief and its application to political, economic, social, and theological thinking, and a denial of the right of any Unitarian Board to dismiss a person for his beliefs, (3) a commendation and greeting to Stephen H. Fritchman, the then suspended editor of the *Christian Register,* and (4) an approval of the A.U.A. resolution on the Unsegregated Church and Unsegregated Society.

A resolution was introduced calling for the separation of the *Christian Register* from the Division of Publications and its establishment as an independent magazine responsible only to the Board of Directors of the American Unitarian Association. Mr. Melvin Arnold, Director of the Division of Publications, who had flown from Boston to be present at this meeting, explained the position of the Division and the administration. A letter from Mr. Fritchman to the Unitarian ministers was also read. Following these presentations and discussion, a motion to postpone action on this resolution was offered and passed.

TENTH ANNIVERSARY MIDWEST UNITARIAN SUMMER ASSEMBLY, COLLEGE CAMP, WISCONSIN, AUGUST 25-SEPTEMBER 1.